

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BILAL ADOM,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CDCR, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [22-cv-07150-JSW](#)

**ORDER ON MISCELLANEOUS  
MOTIONS**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 24, 27, 29

Plaintiff's motion for a discovery meeting with the Defendants is DENIED. The Court does not order such meetings. As previously ordered (ECF No. 9), discovery has been opened, and the parties are expected to cooperate and adhere to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court's Local Rules, including meeting and conferring in good faith to resolve any discovery disputes prior to filing any motions to compel, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a).

Good cause appearing, the motion to extend time to file a dispositive motion is GRANTED. Dispositive motions by all Defendants are due on or before September 27, 2023. Any opposition is due on or before October 24, 2023. Defendants shall file a reply brief on or before November 7, 2023.


Defendant Montegrando's motion to quash is DENIED. The agency to whom the summons was sent was the agency identified by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation ("CDCR") where Dr. Montegrando and Dr. Ladd could be served.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Montegrando or her counsel shall confer with CDCR officials or the California Attorney General ("CAG") to resolve any confusion about where she may be served, and within 14 days either file a notice of appearance, provide the Court with an address where she can be served (under seal if

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Ladd does not contest service at this same address.

necessary), or show cause why not, which will require at a minimum a description of her discussions with CDCR and CAG officials regarding service and an explanation as to why such a discussions did not remove any obstacles to service.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: August 17, 2023



---

JEFFREY S. WHITE  
United States District Judge